

## REMARKS

This response is to the Office Letter mailed in the above-referenced case on November 28, 2001. In Office Letter the Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (5,727,159). Applicant notes that Kikinis was cited as prior art in the last office action dated June 27, 2001.

Applicant has again carefully reviewed the art of Kikinis and has noted the Examiner's rejections and comments. Applicant further argues the patentability of the claims over the art of Kikinis as the reference clearly and unarguably fails to support the 103(a) rejection presented by the Examiner. Applicant points out and argues the key limitations in the base claims that the Examiner appears to have misunderstood in his rejections and statements.

Regarding claim 1 the Examiner states that Kikinis teaches the invention as claimed, including a communications center having agent workstations, a system for enabling a remote agent, using a light computerized device having insufficient power to operate as an agent with full access to data and software tools of the communications center (figure 2), the system comprising a proxy server executing a software suite (proxy server 19, figure 2), a first two-way data link between the proxy server and a server at the communications center (col. 4 lines 15-34), a second two-way data link between the proxy server and the light computerized device used by the remote agent (col. 5 lines 34-52), characterized in that the proxy server, by the software suite, upon establishing a connection over the second data link, upon establishing a connection over the second data link, ascertains hardware and software characteristics of the light computerized device, establishes a connection to a server at the communications center over the first two-way data link that direction of the light computerized

device, accesses data and operates software from the server at the communications center on behalf of and according to direction from the light computerized device, transforms the data and results of the software operations into a form usable by the light device, and transmits the transformed information to the light computerized device via the second two-way data link (col. 5 lines 62-col. 6 line 36).

The Examiner admits that Kikinis does not explicitly teach said server in a workstation. The Examiner takes "Official Notice" that a workstation operating as a server is well-known in the art, and further states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings in the Kikinis system to use a workstation to provide server functions because it would reduce cost compared to the cost of using a mainframe.

Applicant wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to page 5 of the Office Letter wherein the Examiner provides response to Applicant's previous arguments filed on September 25, 2001, which were in response to the previous Office Letter dated June 27, 2001 made Final. Regarding item 11(B), in the response dated September 25, 2001, Applicant argued in substance that the prior art cited and applied by the Examiner does not teach accessing data and operating software from the workstation at the communication center on behalf of and according to direction from the light computerized device. In response the Examiner states, as to point (B) Kikinis teaches that a user uses a hand-held computer to remotely access data, and that a hand-held computer also has capability of executing a host of routines stored in a server (col. 4 lines 15-64, and col. 5 line 62-col. 6 line 36). The Examiner provides further statements admitting that Kikinis does not explicitly teach said server in a workstation, taking "Official Notice" that a workstation operating as a server is well-known in the art, and further states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings

in the Kikinis system to use a workstation to provide server functions because it would reduce cost compared to the cost of using a mainframe. The Examiner states that teachings discussed above read on accessing data and operating software from the workstation at the communication center on behalf of and according to direction from the light computerized device.

Applicant must point out that in the Examiner's response to Applicant's previous arguments, much attention was given to the issue of the hand-held computer connecting to an agent station, but the issue of remotely operating software at the agent station was, Applicant believes, insufficiently addressed and seems to Applicant to have been avoided by the Examiner. Applicant must respectfully traverse the Examiner's position regarding the invention of Kikinis remotely operating software at the agent station, and point out that the heart of the invention of Kikinis is a system in which information received from the Internet is translated by a proxy server into a format usable by a low-power portable computer. Applicant has carefully reviewed col. 4 lines 15-64, and col. 5 line 62-col. 6 line 36 of Kikinis, cited and relied upon by the Examiner, and upon doing so, it is clear to Applicant that the system of Kikinis only has capability of requesting data and receiving data stored in a server such as is commonly done for Web browsing. Applicant has extensively reviewed further the art of Kikinis and can find nowhere in the art anything having to do with remotely accessing software or executing a host of software routines on a server or workstation.

The key distinction in Applicant's claimed invention, substantially argued by Applicant in the previous response, and which seems to have been either misunderstood or avoided in the Examiner's response, is that the software at the agent station cooperates with the hand-held device to operate software at the agent station. The primary scope and spirit of Applicant's invention as claimed is not connecting to an agent station, nor is it for connecting to an agent station for Internet browsing, but rather, it is for

operating software at the agent station from the remote light device, which, in one preferred embodiment of the invention, allows a remote knowledge worker to operate as an agent of a workstation just as though he or she is actually working at the workstation..

Applicant now wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to page 12 of Applicant's specification, and a portion of the first paragraph beginning on line 6 which recites (emphasis added): "*However, as described in the background section, a KW (knowledge worker) away from home (in the field) will not generally have full access to all communication center data and tools unless he/she carries a powerful computer station along, or commandeers a client's station having suitable connectivity and ability to perform all of the applications at the home station. Therefore, having many such highly skilled workers in the field and not in the communication center may be, at times, a considerable liability to the communication center, but unavoidable at times. It is to this aspect that the present invention mostly pertains.*" Further, page 18 lines 18-23 of Applicant's specification recites: "*The inventor provides a method and apparatus whereby such a mobile KW could have full and unfettered access to virtually all data systems and sources housed within his home communication center without having to carry a powerful station or inconveniencing a client by commandeering client resources. This inventive method and apparatus is described below in enabling detail.*" A knowledge worker in the system of Applicant invention may have full access to virtually any type of data or software tools that he could access from his station if you were operating non-remotely from within his own communication center.

An example of such capability in a portable remote computer is given in Applicant's specification (page 23 lines 17-page 24 line 13. In the description an example is given of an instance wherein a mobile knowledge worker may provide full service to a home communication center. Applicant believes that upon careful review of the example it will be clear

to the Examiner that the capability described relative to access to and operation of software is in no way anticipated by the Kikinis reference. The primary goal of Applicant's claimed invention is not Web browsing or connecting to an agent station, but rather, operating software at the agent station directed from the remote light device, which is nowhere taught in Kikinis and is far from obvious.

Applicant believes claim one is therefore patentable over the art of Kikinis as argued in detail above. Claims 2-5 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from patentable claim.

Claim 6 is Applicant's method claim corresponding to independent claim 1, having the same limitation as claim 1 of a proxy server connecting to the workstation at the communication center, accessing data and operating software on behalf of the light computerized device. Therefore, claim 6 is also patentable as argued on behalf of claim 1, and claims 7-10 are patentable on their own merits, or least as depended from a patentable claim.

Regarding item 11(C) of the instant Office action, in the last response applicant specifically requested that the Examiner point out exactly where in Kikinis, or any other reference, the limitations of the claims are taught. In response the Examiner provided Schutzman et al. (5,627,764) hereinafter Schutzman per requested to show that a workstation operating as a server is well known in the art. In item 11(D) Applicant previously argued that there is no suggestion or motivation in the prior art. In view of the above facts and arguments provided by Applicant, the Examiner's responses to items 11(C) and 11(D) are moot, and it is clear that the prior art provided by the Examiner in this response does not anticipate or suggest the invention as herein claimed. It is therefore respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and that this case be passed quickly to issue.

If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby

requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

**Version With Markings to Show Changes Made**

No amendments are herein made to the claims in this Preliminary Response.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Musa Hanhan

by



Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys  
Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457